DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 400 705 FL 024 185

AUTHOR Kartalova, Yuliya B.
TITLE Cross-Cultural Differences in American and Russian General Conventions of Communication.
PUB DATE 96
NOTE 28p.; In: Bouton, Lawrence F., Ed. Pragmatics and Language Learning. Monograph Series Volume 7, p71-96, 1996; see FL 024 180.
PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS College Students; Comparative Analysis; Contrastive Linguistics; Cultural Differences; Foreign Countries; Foreign Students; Higher Education; *Intercultural Communication; Interpersonal Communication; Language Research; Linguistic Theory; *North American English; *Pragmatics; *Russian; *Sociocultural Patterns; *Stereotypes; Study Abroad

ABSTRACT

A study investigated linguistic and non-linguistic conventions of communication between Russians and North Americans and explored how aspects of culture and its institutions are encoded in symbolic meanings in 16 cultural themes (food, money, space, possessions, work, courtesy, marriage, friendship, dating, studying, time, humor, small talk, leisure, religion, planning). The influence of differences in these symbolic meanings on reported instances of Russian-American communication were also identified. In addition, national stereotypes hypothetically created by inadequate interpretations of these themes were elicited and interpreted. Data were gathered through questionnaires administered to 18 American university exchange students in Russia and 20 Russian university exchange students in the United States, and from interviews with an additional 10 American and 7 Russian subjects. Results show marked differences in the symbolic meanings of all 16 themes, and that awareness and successful interpretation of these differences may reduce miscommunication. The different symbolic meanings revealed different attitudes concerning independence, involvement, personal space, and emotionality. The Russian subjects valued personal involvement in communication, while the Americans placed more emphasis on personal space and independence. Contains 12 references. (MSE)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED 400 705

CROSS-CULTURAL DIFFERENCES IN AMERICAN AND RUSSIAN GENERAL CONVENTIONS OF COMMUNICATION

Yuliya B. Kartalova

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Lawrence C Becton

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

FL024185

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

CROSS-CULTURAL DIFFERENCES IN AMERICAN AND RUSSIAN GENERAL CONVENTIONS OF COMMUNICATION

Yuliya B. Kartalova

The present study is devoted to cross-cultural communication between Russians and Americans. The objectives of the research are as follows: to collect linguistic and non-linguistic data on general communication conventions of Americans and Russians, i.e., following Clyne (1983), to explore how aspects of culture and its institutions are encoded in symbolic meanings of 16 cultural themes. The influence of differences in these symbolic meanings on reported instances of Russian-American communication will be identified. The additional purpose of the research is to elicit and interpret national stereotypes which are hypothetically created by inadequate interpretations of the above-mentioned themes.

A qualitative conceptual ethnographic approach has been chosen to gather and interpret reported data on cross-cultural differences in symbolic meanings of money, space, possessions. Written questionnaires were distributed to 18 American university exchange students studying in St. Petersburg, Russia and to 20 Russian university exchange students studying in Iowa, the U.S. After the completion and analysis of the questionnaires, 17 (10 American and 7 Russian) additional subjects agreed to comment on the typicality of cultural differences observed by their Russian/American counterparts in order to test the relative validity of the findings.

The findings show that there are indeed marked differences in the symbolic meanings of all the 16 themes. However, as reported by the subjects, an awareness and successful interpretation of these differences may reduce miscommunication.

The different symbolic meanings of these themes revealed different attitudes of Russian and American subjects to independence, involvement, personal space, emotionality. The Russian subjects value personal involvement in communication, whereas the American subjects place more emphasis on personal space and independence.

The results of the study provide data for interpretation and highlight direction for further research in the area of cross-cultural communication.

INTRODUCTION

The present study is devoted to cross-cultural communication between Russians and Americans. The purpose of this research is to collect linguistic and non-linguistic data on Russian and American general communication conventions, i.e., following Clyne (1983), how aspects of culture and its institutions encoded in symbolic meanings of concepts such

as time, money, space, courtesy, etc., are expressed in language, and to account for their functioning in intercultural communication.

Clyne (1983) divides communicative competence rules into two major categories: "pertaining to general cultural concepts influencing communication, including trust, honor, time and hospitality," and "specific rules, or individual formulae for speech acts" (p. 147). General rules deal with the sociopragmatic aspect of communicative behavior. This paper suggests incorporating the term "general conventions" instead of "general rules" due to a certain negative connotation of prescriptivism associated with the word "rule": "I argue that it is essential to avoid prescriptivism in this very sensitive area of language in use" (Thomas, 1983, p. 90). The focus of investigation will be cross-cultural differences in general communication conventions and how these differences influence face-to-face cross-cultural interaction both linguistically and extralinguistically.

As some cross-cultural studies (e.g., Carbaugh, 1983; Meier, 1992) show, different cultural attitudes towards such relatively universal concepts as time, money, self-determination, small talk, etc., provide possible explanations for observed cross-cultural differences in pragmatic behavior. Therefore, a conceptual interpretative approach, i.e., elicitation and interpretation of observations on cross-cultural differences in symbolic meanings of 16 concepts, or cultural themes, such as money, personal space, courtesy, friendship, as well as reported instances of personal communication illustrating cross-cultural differences in attitudes to these concepts, was used in this study. The additional purpose of this research is to identify national stereotypes which are possibly created by inadequate interpretation of different cultural concepts underlying general communication conventions.

Written questionnaires were designed to elicit personal experiences of miscommunication between Russians and Americans in the U.S. and Russia regarding both instances of miscommunication (linguistic and/or non-linguistic) and observed cultural differences in attitudes to such concepts as money, time, possessions, space, etc. (see Appendix A for a questionnaire sample designed for the American subjects. The questionnaire designed for the Russian subjects was identical except for the substitution of the words "Russia", "Russian" for "the U.S.", "American," and vice versa.) It is hoped that the latter data will enable researchers and language instructors to predict certain problematic areas in cross-cultural communication.

The subjects involved in the study are 18 exchange students from America studying in St. Petersburg, Russia, and 20 Russian exchange university students studying in Iowa, U.S.A. American English was chosen as the language of the questionnaires due to the fact that the American subjects involved are undergraduate students with a relatively low level of proficiency in Russian, whereas the Russian subjects are graduate and undergraduate students with a relatively high level of English proficiency (see, e.g., Table 1 for comparison of the length of previous language instruction of the American and Russian subjects.) Another reason for choosing English was to avoid additional subjectivism on the part of the researcher connected with the task of translation with regard to the choice of words used by the subjects in order to describe the observed cross-cultural phenomena and personal communication.

One of the limitations of this study is the relative subjectivity of both the researcher and subjects in data elicitation and interpretation, which is, however, inherent in any pragmatic research (Knapp, & Knapp-Potthoff, 1987). It is hoped that the number of subjects involved and their direct exposure to a given culture and its language will have a positive effect in achieving the study's objectives and providing current data for further observation and interpretation. See, e.g., Thomas (1983):

> Helping students to understand the way pragmatic principles operate in other cultures, encouraging them to look for the different pragmatic or discoursal norms which may underlie national and ethnic stereotyping, is to go some way towards eliminating simplistic and ungenerous interpretations whose linguistic behavior is superficially different from their own. Such techniques, I would suggest, are desirable both pedagogically and politically (p. 110.)

It is thus hoped that this research will improve Russian-American communication by informing the teaching of both Russian and English.

METHOD

Ethnographic Conceptual Framework

LeVine (1984) defines culture as "a shared organization of ideas that includes the intellectual, moral, and aesthetic standards prevalent in a community and the meanings of communicative actions" (p. 67). However, the author emphasizes that formal descriptions cannot clarify the nature of culture. He argues that this clarification can only be approached through ethnography.

Ochs and Schieffelin (1979) use the term "ethnographic" as pertaining to "descriptions that take into account the perspective of members of a social group, including beliefs and values that underlie and organize their activities and utterances" (p. 283). The term "general conventions of communication" was adopted for this study as referring to interculturally shared views and beliefs of society members with regard to perceived desired behavior. Therefore, ethnographic descriptions of values underlying general communication conventions of a given society can serve as a starting point of cross-cultural research and be used as a means of data-elicitation.

Written data on cross-cultural differences in symbolic meanings of 16 cultural themes, such as money, personal space, courtesy, and their influence on Russian-American communication as observed by the subjects was gathered and interpreted.

Subjects

The subjects of this study consisted of 38 university exchange students between the ages of nineteen and twenty-six. The subjects were represented by 27 females and 11 males. All the subjects had some previous second language instruction in English or in Russian and were studying in the U.S. or Russia under the auspices of the American Council of Teachers

of Russian exchange program at either graduate or undergraduate levels. Most of the students were majoring in Humanities and Fine Arts. The length of the stay of the subjects both in the U.S. and in Russia at the time of administration of the questionnaires varies from one month to two years. All the subjects were nonpaid volunteers.

Table 1: The Subjects of the Study (First Questionnaire)

Demographic Factors	American Subjects	Russian Subjects
1. Average Age	20.8 years	21.4 years
2. Sex		
Females	13 (72.3%)	14 (70%)
Males	5 (27.7%)	6 (30%)
3. Length of Previous Language Instruction	3.6 years	11.1 years
4. Length of Stay in Russia/the U.S.	2.5 months	6.5 months

As one can see, the groups were more or less homogenous as to their age and sex. However, they were less so with regard to their language proficiency and length of stay in the country of a studied language.

Materials and Procedures

Two identical written questionnaires were designed for the American and the Russian subjects. The first one was designed to elicit the subjects' observations concerning cross-cultural differences in the symbolic meanings of cultural themes and instances of personal miscommunication experiences (see Appendix A). The second questionnaire was used to elicit native-speakers' reactions to the observations gathered by the first questionnaire (see Appendix B).

English was chosen for both questionnaires due to the American subjects' relatively low proficiency in Russian (some of the American subjects could not express themselves in Russian in writing). The researcher aimed to avoid direct translations from one language to the other and to ensure that the elicited data with regard to the themes and expressions used by the subjects in their descriptions of the observed phenomena was comparable from one group to the other.

The first questionnaire dealt with differences in attitudes toward cultural themes as observed by the subjects. I have adopted 16 cultural themes, described as recurrent in American values ("time," "money," "work," etc.) as data-elicitation tools (see question 13 in Appendix A.) This choice was in part due to the relative availability of data on these (see, e.g., Stewart & Bennett, 1991; Althen, 1988) for Americans.

A question concerning positive/negative traits of the American national character (see question 18 in Appendix A) was included in the questionnaire in order to elicit cross-cultural differences in values and assumptions underlying positive and negative personal characteristics in both cultures, and to investigate grounds for possible creation of some positive/negative national stereotyping.

Questions concerning age, gender, degree of proficiency in English/Russian, and length of stay in a culture of a studied language were designed in order to ensure some low-level statistical information about the subjects (see, e.g., Table 1).

At the end of the questionnaire, the subjects were encouraged to make any additional personal comments concerning the research in progress.

The questionnaires were distributed to the Russian and American subjects in person and via ACTR representatives in Russia. The subjects were given approximately a month to fill out the questionnaires. They were encouraged to take note of all instances of miscommunication and different attitudes to the cultural themes during this time.

The second questionnaire (see Appendix B) attempted to test the relative validity of the findings and to elicit additional cultural values and assumptions inherent in the ones previously discussed. The interpretative method implemented by Ertelt-Vieth (1990) in the contrastive analysis of West German and Russian perceptions was adopted for this purpose. Following this method, observations elicited by the first questionnaire were selected on the basis of the frequency of occurrences of these or similar observations. Ten subjects from the U.S. and seven subjects from Russia agreed to comment on the typicality and accuracy of the description of cultural differences, observed by the Russian/American counterparts. The subjects of the second questionnaire were Russian and American volunteers who had not participated in filling out of the first questionnaire. These volunteers were hard to find, and unfortunately their unequal numbers limit interpretation of their commentaries. However, it was possible to develop a list of observations and commentaries revealing cross-cultural differences in some general communication conventions and in the symbolic meanings of cultural themes. It is this list which will receive more detailed analysis here.

Limitations

The findings of this study cannot be viewed as pertaining to the American and Russian cultures as wholes. Being one of the first studies to involve Russian and American students living abroad in each other's countries, this research dealt with a limited and unequal number of participants, who were relatively hard to find. Therefore, this study is not intended to establish generalizations concerning "typical" Russians and Americans. Moscow and St. Petersburg, for example, do not represent the entire Russian culture. A larger study of this kind is needed to verify and evaluate the findings, which can at this point be viewed as at least suggestive. However, the findings of this research do provide directions for further study of culture-specific values and their functioning in language and communication.

In addition, the relative subjectivity of both the researcher and subjects with regard to data-elicitation and interpretation must be kept in mind. Prior to designing and completing

the research, the researcher observed certain differences in the cultural themes chosen for the study. Other individuals might have noticed and viewed as important other cultural themes and dimensions valuable for cross-cultural research.

Another important limitation of the study is the relative heterogeneity of the American and the Russian groups with regard to language proficiency. The comparatively limited proficiency of the Americans in Russian could have reduced the amount of authentic cross-cultural contact as compared to the Russians in the U.S. In addition, the results may have been influenced by the choice of words used to describe some culture-specific concepts, e.g., "small talk," etc.

Despite the limitations described above, the findings of the study are valuable in providing insights for cross-cultural research. They provide insights into the cultures under study and point to important areas for further research employing an ethnographic framework.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

This section will provide a brief overview of data elicited, followed by a discussion of some selected findings which illustrate the nature of the present qualitative ethnographic research.

Cultural Themes

All the American subjects presented at least four responses to the cultural themes presented in the first questionnaire. The largest number of responses (sixteen, which constitutes 10.2% of the total number of American observations) was elicited by the theme "food." The smallest number of observations (four, or 2.5% of the total) dealt with the dimension of "planning."

All Russian subjects responded with at least nine observations on all the themes offered. The largest number of responses (eighteen, or 8.6% of the total number) concerned the topic "money." The smallest number of responses (nine, or 4.3%) was elicited by the theme "dating."

The frequency distributions of the American and Russian observations of differences in attitudes toward the cultural concepts are shown in Table 2.

Table 2: Frequency Distributions of American and Russian Data on Cultural Themes

American Responses		Russian Responses	
Themes	Observations	Themes	Observations
1. food	16 (10.2%)	1. money	18 (8.6%)
2. money	15 (9.6%)	2. food	17 (8.1%)
3. space	15 (9.6%)	3. work	17 (8.1%)
4. possessions	14 (8.9%)	4. courtesy	15 (7.1%)
5. work	12 (7.6%)	5. studying	15 (7.1%)
6. courtesy	11 (7%)	6. possessions	14 (6.6%)
7. marriage	11 (7%)	7. small talk	13 (6.2%)
8. friendship	10 (6.4%)	8. time	13 (6.2%)
9. dating	8 (5.1%)	9. leisure	13 (6.2%)
10. studying	8 (5.1%)	10. religion	12 (5.7%)
11. time	7 (4.4%)	11. planning	11 (5.2%)
12. humor	7 (4.4%)	12. marriage	11 (5.2%)
13. small talk	6 (3.8%)	13. humor	11 (5.2%)
14. leisure	6 (3.8%)	14. space	10 (4.7%)
15. religion	6 (3.8%)	15. friendship	10 (4.7%)
16. planning	4 (2.5%)	16. dating	9 (4.3%)

Note: The total number of American observations is 156; the total for the Russians is 209.

"Positive" and "Negative" Traits of American and Russian "Characters"

Both the American (72%) and the Russian subjects (95%) stated their views on traits of Russian and American characteristics that they considered positive and negative. A complete list of "traits" mentioned by the subjects is provided in Appendices E and F.

Ethnographic Conceptual Framework for Studying Cultures

Though individual and contextual variation present in any sample survey may prevent a researcher from drawing any conclusions concerning the thoughts, feelings, and behavior shared by members of a community, there are grounds for establishing a conceptual

framework for cross-cultural research. As LeVine (1984) states, individual members of a community "hold in common understandings of the symbols and representations through which they communicate" (p. 68). The findings of this study suggest that symbolic meanings of relatively universal human concepts, such as time, work, money, etc., may be culture-specific and highlight cross-cultural differences in views and values, underlying these concepts.

Though the observations collected from the American and Russian subjects differ a great deal in personal, contextual and situational aspects, there are certain systematic similarities in the concepts used by the subjects from both countries in order to describe differences between Russian and American attitudes to such cultural themes, as "food," "money," and "personal space." These concepts pertain to general communication conventions viewed as appropriate in a given society due to the underlying values shared by its members. In the American case, these are the concepts inherent in the symbolic meaning of the value of "independence": self-reliance; choice; respect of personal boundaries; informality; security; self-determination; self-control; individual responsibility; individual success; punctuality; friendliness. In the case of Russian subjects, these are the concepts of the value of involvement; hospitality; generosity; trust; concern; sincerity; directness; intimacy; loyalty; emotional commitment; spontaneity; flexibility; "inner" freedom of feelings and thoughts pertaining to morality.

These lists of concepts are open-ended, as they contain only the notions which were used by the subjects of this particular study. The terms, sometimes used interchangeably by the subjects in order to describe the above concepts, are not claimed to be the optimal ones until a larger study on these is mounted.

The American Heritage Dictionary (1992) provides further support for the choice of terms of "involvement" and "independence" characterizing the values underlying the American and Russian observations of cross-cultural communication. Some of the meanings of the adjective "independent" are : "self-governing"; "self-reliant"; "self-supporting"; "not determined by someone or something else." Some of the lexical meanings of the verb "to involve" are: "to connect closely"; "to influence or affect"; "to make complex or intricate"; and inherent in the adjective "involved" are such meanings as "curled inward"; "confused"; "emotionally committed." This led to the conclusion that the concepts, chosen by the subjects in order to describe in English cross-cultural differences in attitudes toward cultural themes, pertained at least partially to the broader values of independence and involvement.

In the following section I will analyze some of the examples from the data in order to illustrate how the values of independence and involvement influence the Russian and American general conventions of communication. Some of the observation and commentaries of the Russian and American subjects are provided in the Appendices C,D,E, and F. A complete list of responses is available upon request.

Independence and Involvement

Hospitality and choice. The topics of "food" and the symbolic act of "eating" elicited the most observations on cross-cultural differences between Russians and Americans. Cross-

cultural differences in symbolic meanings of the act of eating seem to be the major source of misunderstandings and interpersonal conflicts for the Americans studying in Russia. As one can see from the American and Russian students' observations (Appendices C,D,E,F), offering food to others in one's house is viewed by Russians as an act of displaying courtesy and hospitality to a guest. Refusal to eat is often perceived as impolite and even rude by Russian hosts.

One can see a clash of different symbolic meanings inherent in the act of eating for Russians and Americans. The American values of independence and choice (see, e.g., Althen, 1988) are being violated by the Russian desire to express hospitality and concern towards the guest, and Russians feel that their hospitality is being rejected (see, e.g., U.S. observation 5; Russian comment 3). As a result, both parties perceive the other as acting inappropriately. According to the data elicited, Russians are thus viewed as "pushy" by Americans and the latter as being "rude" when refusing to eat.

One may hypothesize that some of the "negative" traits of the "Russian character" as described by American subjects (see, e.g., "insistence that their way is the right way," "It is difficult to say 'no' to them," "no respect for personal space and privacy") were to some extent triggered by different symbolic meanings of food and eating, reflecting different attitudes towards independence and involvement in these two cultures.

On the part of the Russian subjects, the American's concern for the "independence" and "choice" of others, as reflected in the way Americans offer their guests food, is viewed as unwillingness to share (see Russian observation 5).

External and internal personal boundaries. As the findings of the study suggest, the relative importance of personal boundaries as a means of preserving one's independence underlies most of American communication conventions. Wierzbicka (1991) claims that the concept of "privacy" is characteristic of Anglo-Saxon cultures: "It is assumed that every individual would want, so to speak, to have a little wall around him/her, at least part of the time, and this is perfectly natural, and very important" (p. 47).

Closely connected with the concept of "privacy" is "personal space," which was used in the American data to describe physical and psychological distance between individuals. It seems to also pertain to possessions, thereby "marking" personal boundaries. This can be illustrated by Russian observation 7 on "personal space": "Once I left one of my books on my roommate's desk. She asked me never to do it again, because it's her desk and she wants to keep it only to herself."

There are no direct lexical equivalents to such concepts as "privacy" and "personal space" in Russian. "Privacy" is associated with "private life" and refers to male-female romantic relationships. The concept of "privacy" for Russians can also imply the "inner world" of a person, one's "personality" or "soul."

The data shows that symbolic meanings of "personal" are also different. "Americans consider things 'personal' only if they relate to the individuals immediately involved" (Stewart & Bennett, 1991, p. 103). The concept of "money" is described in the American

data as "personal", that is, relating to a persona, and therefore inappropriate for discussion. From the American point of view, questions about money and salaries seem to endanger a person's need for "independence" and "security."

According to the American data, they are not viewed as such in Russia: "People don't seem to think money is a very personal matter" (U.S. observation 1). "Russians have no qualms about giving money out to friends and acquaintances," states an American student (U.S. observation 2). She illustrates this statement with the description of a situation in which her Russian host mother asked her if she had a substantial sum of money to give to her neighbor. "There was no talk of when it would be repaid." As Russian commentary 2 suggests, "Russians lend money, but they usually expect it to be repaid. It is implied. You don't speak of it." Thus, speaking about the conditions of repayment might violate the value of "trust" for the Russians.

Borrowing money can be viewed as quite appropriate by Russians as it instantiates the values of "trust," "concern" for another person, and "generosity" of the person lending the money. Thus, the symbolic meaning of borrowing money serves to establish involvement with another person. "Relationships" are perceived as a more "personal matter" by the Russian subjects than is money (see, e.g., Russian comment 1 on U.S. observation 1, where money is described as a "personal" matter by an American subject, whereas a Russian subject applies the adjective "personal" to relationships for cross-cultural comparison of values.)

From this point of view, close personal relationships may not be an appropriate conversational topic with a group of "acquaintances" ("friends" in American English). As the data shows, Russians may consider things "personal" if they pertain to their "inner world." The topics of "dating" and "religion," for example, are described as too "personal" by the Russian subjects and require a certain intimacy, loyalty and emotional commitment between interlocutors.

This could explain some Russian comments to the effect that American college students mention their girlfriend/boyfriend "at every appropriate and inappropriate occasion" (Russian observation 10). The topic of dating is "a more intimate matter, not to be discussed casually." The latter data leads to a clash of such concepts as "informality," "friendliness," and "intimacy" in Russian-American communication.

Friendliness and intimacy. Wierzbicka (1991) claims that democratic values underlying communication conventions in American society place an emphasis on informality and overall friendliness, thus weakening the need for intimacy. Intimacy can be described as an intense involvement with another person, both physical and emotional. This type of involvement is considered one of the most essential constituents of symbolic meanings of such themes as "friendship" and "dating" in Russia, according to both Russian (9,10) and American (9,10) observations.

"Here they don't even think of saying 'no' to a friend," an American student observes (10). Indeed, the involvement is "intensive," according to the American data. A young Russian woman gets "in a fight" with her "boyfriend" and calls the American student's

friend late at night. The young woman goes to her friend to help her. "When talking to my host family, I once called a male friend I was talking about 'my friend.' My hosts immediately thought the friend was very close to me and probably someone I loved." (U.S. observation 9).

According to the data, American college students do not get very much "involved" in either "friendship" or "dating." The broader meanings of such concepts as "friend," "boyfriend/girlfriend" in American English as compared to Russian can be explained by a more quantitative rather than qualitative type of involvement sought by Americans as opposed to Russians. "To have a steady boyfriend/girlfriend...is very important to American college students" (Russian observation 10). "Relationships define sexuality and so people that don't have mates are assumed to be homosexual or weird in some matter" (American comment 7 on Russian observation 10). To have "friends" and "mates" means "to be sociable" and "friendly" and capable of establishing informal relationships. In contrast, it is not viewed as "weird" not to have a lot of friends and dates in Russia.

Courtesy and respect. The themes of "money," "courtesy," and "dating" yielded Russian and American observations which highlighted cross-cultural differences in views on male and female roles in the two societies. An additional theme of "respect" as elicited from both American and Russian subjects proves to be beneficial for cross-cultural comparison.

There are certain "minor" connotations inherent in the symbolic meaning of "courtesy" for a Russian woman that dictate what she expects a man to do for her. As Russian observation 3 points out, opening a door or helping her put on a coat symbolizes the "respect" that a man should display towards a woman. The absence or a perceived lack of such behavior leads some of the Russian female observers to conclude that American men are not courteous. As American comments 3a, 3b show, the symbolic meanings of "respect" are different for Russian and American females. As opposed to Russian females, who view "respects" as being shown by certain "courteous" acts carried out by males, the American females consider these acts disrespectful. As American comment 3a claims, "Women in the U.S. don't want men "to take care of them", - they wish to show themselves to be "independent" and "want respect" not just because of their gender, but also because she is a valuable member of society" (American comment 3b).

The American value of independence again underlies the above observations on what is considered to be appropriate behavior of males towards females in the U.S. As to the Russian "courtesy code," male behavior is perceived as appropriate when it demonstrates involvement with a woman, be it opening a door for her or paying for her when going out.

These culturally different views on appropriate male and female behavior most likely contribute to the view that Russian culture is sexist, as characterized by some American subjects (see, e.g., a list of "negative" traits of the Russian national character in Appendix E).

The above values of independence and involvement underlying the Russian and American general conventions of communication point out to cross-cultural differences in views on successful communication, which will be described in the following section.

Differences in Views on Successful Communication

Some cross-cultural differences in Russian and American views on successful communication were revealed by the Russian and American observations and comments on such themes as "courtesy," "work," "small talk." The analyzed data suggest that the emphasis on preserving independence underlies general conventions of communication of the American subjects. As for the Russian subjects, the value of involvement is viewed as an essential component of successful communication. The observed cross-cultural differences in non-verbal behavior also seem to support this claim. Some examples from the data illustrate this point.

Both the American and Russian subjects claim that the notion of "small talk" may not be typical of the Russian culture. Russians were reported by some observants to either discontinue a "meaningless" conversation or "go more in-depth."

American ritualized exchanges of greetings were viewed by the Russian students as "phony" and "indirect." A typical stereotype of Americans as being "insincere" was evident in some cases (see, e.g., a list of American negative traits in Appendix F). In contrast with the American subjects' desire to display equal "friendliness" to everyone, Russians do not seem to view it as necessary. Moreover, friendliness displayed by smiling or exchanging greetings is often interpreted by Russians as a desire for a greater "intimacy" (see, e.g., U.S. observation 6 where the act of "smiling" is opposed to "working" by a Russian worker). Russians were described by the American subjects as friendly and open when they knew a person and "mean, pushy" when they didn't know one.

Direct and open expression of thoughts and feelings, be they positive or negative, is viewed by Russians as permissible and sometimes has the positive connotation of displaying concern and involvement with an interlocutor. Complaining about one's misfortunes is viewed as appropriate by the Russian subjects as it reinforces the values of "trust" and "sincerity." From the American perspective, such actions may violate the interlocutors' desire to preserve independence: "The 'non-answer' of 'I'm fine' is often used when one is not sure whether the person to whom one is talking is really interested in knowing a true answer to a question, which is often a 'non-question': 'How are you?'" (U.S. comment 2).

In most cases of cross-cultural misunderstanding, the American and Russian subjects faced differences in the interpretation of non-verbal messages and communication conventions. Both viewed the nature of conversation from different perspectives and sought topics appropriate from their point of view and inappropriate from the point of view of their interlocutors. Whereas Americans often felt a "threat" to their "personal space" and "security," Russians were equally offended by "indirectness," "insincerity," and "lack of depth" in conversations. Both had different expectations of successful communication due to the different values underlying general conventions of communication.

Cross-Cultural Miscommunication or Communication?

As seen from the above, there can be marked differences between Russian and American subjects with regard to their expectations of communication as informed by the

underlying cultural values. In fact, one might wonder how any successful communication could have occurred. Following is an observation elicited from an American subject studying in Russia, which provides some insights to this question:

> I have always attempted to look at situations with cultural perspective, and cannot recall any one incident of serious (or even moderate) miscommunication. I often feel that my host family, especially my grandparents, do not realize what striking cultural differences we have, nor could they imagine my American way of life. But, being prepared to immerse myself in Russian culture, and having been somewhat aware of several differences, I have found that my expectations and willingness have made cultural communication much easier than finding the right case and aspect.

There are some solutions offered by the observer which are of crucial importance for successful cross-cultural communication. The first is the student's awareness of some cross-cultural differences. This made it possible to some extent to shape her expectations concerning Russian culture and people. The second point is of no less importance, i.e., the "willingness" to "immerse oneself" in Russian culture and "look at situations with a cultural perspective."

Another observation elicited from a Russian student is enlightening, too. She describes a change of her perceptions about Americans after her stay in the U.S. due to establishing grounds for successful interpersonal communication:

> My perceptions have changed. I found that Americans can be very close, in an informal personal way, but it takes time for them to know about a person, to start having special feelings towards people. I found that I was comfortable with this way of communication. At the beginning I did not feel it because people needed time to know me and treat me in the way they do now.

This observation suggests that equal effort is required from both the speaker and the hearer to adjust to communication styles of each other and to establish common grounds for achieving rapport in communication.

Other solutions offered by the observants were: overt discussion of cross-cultural differences (U.S. observation 2); developing pragmatic comprehension of non-verbal messages (Russian observation 2); deliberate speculation on cross-cultural differences (Russian observation 6).

It is impossible to predict all the situations and cross-cultural differences that could lead to interpersonal conflict. It is possible, however, to develop the students' awareness of cross-cultural differences and shape some of their expectations about cross-cultural communication.

It is also possible to provide the students with some strategies that they can use to achieve mutual understanding. I would like to suggest that such strategies can be successfully implemented by the speakers only if they share or are willing to share, through negotiation,

some background and/or emotional experience and are relatively free from national stereotyping.

Another approach may be to treat communication breakdowns as expected and necessary in cross-cultural interaction, and as facilitative in developing communicative competence. After all, it is only through learning about differences in views that a person can become aware of her/his own assumptions and values. "A significant outcome of knowing about conversational style is knowing itself, knowing that no one is crazy and no one is mean and that a certain amount of misinterpretation and adjustment is normal in communication" (Tannen, 1986, p. 199).

CONCLUSIONS

The present study dealt with cross-cultural communication between Russians and Americans. A conceptual ethnographic approach was chosen to elicit cross-cultural differences of general conventions of communication in American English and Russian. Differences in symbolic meanings of 16 cultural themes, such as "food," "money," "work," and the influence of these differences on Russian-American cross-cultural communication were investigated.

The findings of the study suggest that there are significant differences in the symbolic meanings of all of the themes studied. Various examples of cross-cultural differences in attitudes toward choice, respect, trust, self-reliance provide guidelines to establishing hierarchies of values and assumptions inherent in different cultures. According to the findings, Americans place emphasis on independence and personal space, whereas Russians require intense involvement with a person. The concept of "personal" seems to vary cross-culturally.

Different cultural assumptions may underlie different views on what is "polite" and "rude." In some cases a "clash" in views leads to communication breakdowns and the creation of national stereotypes. In other cases, this "clash" is renegotiated through the mutual willingness of the interlocutors to establish a common ground for successful communication.

The findings of the study present substantial grounds for further analysis.

DIRECTIONS FOR FURTHER RESEARCH

It is hoped that the findings of this study will provide a basis for establishing culture-specific approaches to studying and teaching language-specific communicative competences.

The findings of this study can be also analyzed in respects to their typicality for Russian and American cultures and frequency of occurrence of various concepts used by the subjects in their descriptions of cross-cultural differences. This might provide additional data for cross-cultural comparison.

A more detailed analysis of communication encounters can highlight a variety of strategies used by interlocutors in order to renegotiate communication breakdowns and achieve rapport in cross-cultural interaction.

In general, the study and its findings may be of interest to linguists, social psychologists, sociologists, scholars of Russian and American cultures, and the general public on both sides of the Atlantic.

APPLICATION TO TEACHING CROSS-CULTURAL COMMUNICATION

The findings of the study point to the importance of learners' awareness-raising with regard to cultural values and assumptions underlying general conventions of communication in the target language. As suggested by the subjects of the study, awareness-raising can serve as a means of shaping the students' expectations concerning cross-cultural communication and providing grounds for establishing mutual understanding and rapport in authentic interaction.

There is a need to combine linguistic instruction with explicit discussion of cultural assumptions, values and etiquette norms of the target language culture as compared to the learners' own cultural and individual assumptions and views. This comparison may help the students to develop a relatively unbiased and stereotype-free outlook on a variety of cultural norms and communicative styles and to reject treating this variety "in terms of deviations from one 'basic', 'natural' model" (Wierzbicka, 1991, p. 455).

It is hoped that the findings of this study provide material for cross-cultural comparison of views and values underlying Russian-American communication and will therefore contribute to teaching Russian and American English communicative competences.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to express my special thanks to all American and Russian volunteers who participated in this study and served as my "eyes" and "ears" for observing cross-cultural communication both in the U.S. and in Russia during 1994-95 academic year.

I would also like to express my gratitude to my thesis advisor, Professor A.J. Meier, whose enthusiasm and timely guidance made this study possible.

Recognition is also due to Professor T.E. O'Connor for all the help he provided for me to carry out this study on both sides of the Atlantic.

THE AUTHOR

Yuliya Kartalova has been an Instructor of English at Moscow State Linguistic University (1990-92). She attended the University of Northern Iowa from 1992-95, earning her MATESOL. Presently she works for RCI Finland in Helsinki.

REFERENCES

Althen, G. (1988) *American ways*. Yarmouth: Intercultural Press, Inc.

The American heritage dictionary of the English language (3rd ed.). (1992) Boston: Houghton Mifflin Co.

Carbaugh, D. (1983) Competence as cultural pragmatics. In R. Wiseman & J. Koester (eds.), *Intercultural communication competence* (pp. 168-183). London: Sage.

Clyne, M. (1983) Communicative competences in contact. In L.E. Smith (ed.), *Readings in English as an international language* (pp. 147-162). Oxford: Pergamon Press.

Ertelt-Vieth, A. (1990) Culture and 'hidden culture' in Moscow: A contrastive analysis of West German and Soviet perceptions. In D. Buttjes & M. Byram (eds.), *Mediating languages and cultures: Towards an intercultural theory of foreign language education* (pp. 159-177). Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.

Knapp, K. & A. Knapp-Potthoff. (1987) Instead of an introduction: Conceptual issues in analyzing intercultural communication. In K. Knapp et. al. (eds.), *Analyzing intercultural communication* (pp. 37-49). Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

LeVine, R. (1984) Properties of culture: an ethnographic view. In R.A. Schweder & R.W. LeVine (eds.), *Culture theory: Essays on mind, self, and emotion* (pp. 67-87). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Meier, A.J. (1992) *A sociopragmatic contrastive study of repair work in Austrian German and American English*. Unpublished dissertation. Vienna, Austria.

Ochs, E. & B. Schieffelin (eds.). (1979) *Developmental pragmatics*. New York: Academic Press.

Stewart, E. & M. Bennett. (1991) *American cultural patterns: A cross-cultural perspective*. Yarmouth: Intercultural Press, Inc.

Tannen, D. (1986) *That's now what I meant!* New York: William Morrow and Company, Inc.

Thomas, J. (1983) Cross-cultural pragmatic failure. *Applied Linguistics*, *4*, 91-112.

Wierzbicka, A. (1991) *Cross-cultural pragmatics: The semantics of human interaction*. New York: Mouton de Gruyter.

APPENDIX A: QUESTIONNAIRE SAMPLE FOR AMERICAN STUDENTS

1. Age
2. Sex F M
3. American University/High school that you represent
4. How long have you been in Russia?
5. How long do you plan to stay in Russia?
6. What is the purpose of your stay in Russia? (Include both academic and personal expectations).
7. Do you feel that your expectations are being met? Explain.
8. Do you communicate in English, or in Russian most of the time? Explain.
9. How long have you studied Russian? Name the institutions, if any, where you studied Russian (e.g., high school, college/university, private teachers). Indicate whether your instructors were Russian or American.
10. What are the major purposes of your communication with Russians: academic, business, personal, etc.? Try to name as many as you can in order of frequency.
11. What age, sex, occupational groups of Russians do you find the most satisfying and interesting to communicate with?
12. What age, sex, occupational groups of Russians do you find the most unsatisfactory or boring to communicate with?
13. Have you made any personal friends/acquaintances with Russians? Indicate their age, sex, occupation. How do you spend your time with them?
14. Do you feel there are any major cultural differences between Russian and American attitudes towards the following:

a) money	g) courtesy	m) small talk
b) possessions	h) friendship	n) self-determination (attitude to planning)
c) personal space	i) studying	o) marriage
d) work	j) dating	p) humor
e) time	k) religion	
f) leisure activities	l) food (eating)	

   If you do, support it with at least one example, based on <u>your own</u> experience.
15. Can you recall episodes when the aim of your communication was not achieved due to misinterpretation by your conversation partner or vice versa? (Try to write down the dialog(s) word for word and explain what was wrong, in your opinion).
16. What, in your opinion, are the most positive and negative traits of Russian character? Briefly explain why you think so.
17. Are you generally satisfied/disappointed with cross-cultural communication you have experienced so far? Explain.
18. Have any of your perceptions of Russia and Russians changed after your stay in Russia? Try to be specific.

If you have any additional comments or ideas, you are more than welcome to share them with us. How would you have improved the questionnaire, if you were doing this research? If you think this questionnaire helped you to shape your own perceptions of Russian culture, please let us know. Thank you for your cooperation!

APPENDIX B:
SAMPLES OF EVALUATION GUIDELINES FOR RUSSIAN STUDENTS

Please read the samples of intercultural observations and/or personal encounters provided by American students studying in Russia as their illustrations of different attitudes of Russians and Americans to some cultural concepts mentioned below. Do you think these observations/episodes are typical of the Russian culture as you see it? Mark their typicality and adequacy of interpretation by the American students, and if their perceptions of the situations are either partially or fully different from yours, submit your own explanations of the observed phenomena. If you consider some of these pure generalizations and/or stereotyping, please feel free to say so, as the additional goal of this survey is to elicit and study national stereotypes. How would you have advised the American students to behave (say and/or do) to 'save' the situations in which, in your opinion, communication breakdowns occurred?

If you can, please provide description(s) of concepts (e.g., 'courtesy', etc.) with regard to what you think they symbolize to most Russians (or at least to you personally).

Thank you very much for your cooperation!

Please answer the following statistical preview questions:

1. Age
2. Sex F M
3. Main occupation
4. Main place of residence
5. Have you ever lived abroad? If yes, please specify.
6. Please underline your level of proficiency in English.
   poor adequate good excellent
7. Have you ever experienced personal communication with Americans? Please specify in brief.

APPENDIX C: U.S. OBSERVATIONS

1. money
Money matters are extremely different in Russia. My host mom/dad freely discuss their salaries (how little they make) with me. People also never give me my "personal space" when I'm changing money or getting cash advances at the bank. On numerous occasions people have leaned right on me over the counter where I'm getting money. People don't seem to think money is a very personal matter.

2. money
Russians have no qualms about giving money out to friends and acquaintances. Last year my host mother called me up and asked if I had 50,000 roubles (when it meant something) that I could give to a neighbor. I was taken a little aback and really didn't know what to say. Although I had the money I didn't want to get rid of it. There was no talk of when it would be repaid. I think she was a little offended at first. Then we talked about our different views in relationship to money.

3. courtesy
While caps and hats in the States can be worn now anywhere indoors in the presence of anyone, a Russian is expected to remove his "golovnoj ubor" [cap/hat] whenever under a roof. Whereas in the States, many, thanks to feminism, a woman is offended when a male opens the door for her, a Russian woman expects traditional, chivalrous mode courtesy.

4. possessions
I didn't understand the "If it's on the table, it's for everyone" mentality. I lost a lot of good cigarettes that way. Highly criticized for being "stingy" when I wouldn't share my bottled water with people straight out of the bottle.

5. food
Whenever I am a guest at a Russian house I have noticed that eating is almost required. A friend will ask "Would you like to eat?", but this really isn't a question, it is more a polite way of saying, "Sit down and eat what I have prepared for you." I once responded that I had just eaten at another friend's house and I was not hungry, and my hostess was very offended. She said she had worked all day to prepare the food and asked me whether or not I liked her cooking and then led me to the dinner table and piled a plate full of food for me. I now find it is better to just answer "yes" to the first question.

6. work (smiling)
People here seem to hate their jobs, and feel that they can't smile when they're working. For example, one lady (working behind the counter) began smiling for some reason, and a fellow co-worker told her not to smile, because she should be working. To them, work is just a place to make money.

7. small talk
I have noticed that my friends and host parents won't hesitate to talk about politics and economic and social problems with me. Perhaps it's because they know I am American,

or perhaps it is just their form of small talk. I was a bit surprised when I asked a friend how she was and she responded by telling me everything that had gone wrong that day and what she had to do the next day. Americans usually respond with a meaningless "Fine," or "Good" and talk about the weather or the news.

8. small talk
With the discussion, even in passing, the Russians take more emotional investment with every word than the average American.

9. friendship
I think friendship is more important to Russians than it is to Americans. An American can get to know someone and within a few days call that person their friend. A Russian will call someone an acquaintance unless they have known someone for a very big time, or are related to them. When talking to my host family, I once called a male friend I was talking about "my friend." My hosts immediately thought the friend was very close to me and probably someone I loved. It was difficult to explain to them that he was only an acquaintance and not someone I would ever fall in love with.

10. friendship
I think friendship is very important here. They would do anything for each other with no ulterior motives and expectations. Americans are not so freely giving of their time and resources. Here they don't even think of saying "no" to their friends. If it is possible they do it. For instance, one of my friend's friend got in a fight with her boyfriend and called my friend late at night and of course she went to her.

APPENDIX D: RUSSIAN OBSERVATIONS

1. money

I think for Americans money is a very important concern, more than anything else. Sometimes it seems to me that making money is the purpose of their life. I knew one student who was smart and was getting excellent grades. When I asked him, what was the purpose of his studying hard, he said: "I want to make big money."

2. courtesy

A friend called me at the moment of her strong personal distress. After she greeted me, I asked: "How are you?" and she said, "I am fine, thank you." I said, "Your voice sounds strange. Is anything wrong?" and she said "Yes." Then she broke into tears and shared her problem with me. So, the phrase "I am fine" had no meaning whatsoever, although I took it literally and was ready to say that I was busy and "let us talk later," which would have been very impolite towards her at that moment. The Russian language is more direct in such situations and does not use phony phrases, which abound in English.

3. courtesy

The attitude towards girls and women is very different here from the one we have in Russia and in Europe. I'm more or less used that men let me go first or will open the door for me. I cannot say that American men do not do that at all, but very often they just slam the door in front of me. I want this minor courtesy not because I consider myself weaker than men or cannot do it myself, but because I expect respect from men.

4. possessions

American attitude towards material things is more serious (than Russian). They don't trust people, even those whom they know/live with. For example, when we were exchanging CD's with one of the residents of our House, he put his name in ink on the CD cover, thus spoiling it. He said, "Not that I don't trust you, but..."

5. food

Very often when Americans are hungry they just get food for themselves and rarely ask people around whether they are hungry or not.

6. food

The idea of "doing one's own thing" and "having it one's own way" is very important for Americans. I can see it the way Americans eat. I mean the idea "make your own dish."

7. personal space

Once I left one of my books on my roommate's desk. She asked me to never do it again, because it's her desk and she wants to keep it only to herself.

8. small talk

In the U.S., people would hate it but make small talk, because everybody else is doing the same. Small talk skills are very valued. Russians, in my observations, might not always bother to carry on a meaningless conversation; they would either quit or get more in-depth. In the U.S., conversations (especially between people who have just met) would

never progress beyond small talk.

9. friendship

Friendship is not as an intense involvement with another person as it often is with Russians. One American would call another his "friend," and they would only get together a few times a year "to shoot ball." Besides, "friendship" is sometimes used by Americans as a euphemism for a romantic relationship. "He is just my friend" is used to stress that it is not a boyfriend/girlfriend type of relationship.

10. dating

To have a steady boyfriend/girlfriend and mention him/her at every appropriate and inappropriate occasion and be "going out with somebody" is very important to American college students. Even more so, than to Russians. Dating is always a conversational topic with strangers. It's not uncommon that Americans would ask you if you have a boyfriend one minute after they've met you. To Russians the whole boyfriend/girlfriend "stuff" is a more intimate matter, not to be discussed casually.

APPENDIX E: U.S. COMMENTS ON RUSSIAN OBSERVATIONS

1. money 1:
Americans are very money-conscious. We view money as security and freedom. We don't share our income amounts with others because we don't want to be embarrassed by how little we earn, or intimidating by how much we earn.

2. courtesy 2:
A key word here is the Russian student's use of "phony." This is rather judgmental. Each of the cultures shows courtesy in different ways. The "non-answer" of "I am fine" is often used when one is not sure whether the person to whom one is talking is really interested in knowing a true answer to a question, which is often a "non-question": "How are you?" By introducing the first part of a stock exchange, knowingly or not, the Russian elicited the stock response from the American.

3. courtesy 3:
3a: This deals with male/female relationships. Women in the U.S. don't want men "taking care of them"--they wish to show themselves to be independent.
3b: I want and deserve respect from men as well but not just because I am a woman but a valuable person and I don't need someone to hold a door for me to make me feel that respect. I would much rather have recognition for what I have said or done or a service I have provided. If you want the door held for you hold it for the men sometimes. They enjoy it too.

4. food 6:
This has to do with independence, not food! "Make your own dish" really means--"Cook what you feel like." It has to do with "choice." There is also the expression for parties of all sorts--"B.Y.O.B." ("Bring your own booze."). It has to do with choice again.

5. small talk 8:
Small talk is the act of communicating, although at times it may be annoying. It's being friendly. I'd rather have someone ask me a few general questions rather than just stare into space as if s/he weren't alive.

6. friendship 9:
"Friend" has a "loose" meaning in English. But if you have a "true" friend, s/he is called a "best friend" or "close friend."

7. dating 10:
At one time, we wouldn't have discussed it as openly, but relationships define sexuality and so people that don't have mates are assumed to be homosexual or weird in some manner. Asking if you have a boyfriend or a girlfriend can be a way of finding a boy or girlfriend, or a way of determining sexuality.

APPENDIX F: RUSSIAN COMMENTS ON U.S. OBSERVATIONS

1. money 1:
It has become proverbial, has it not? On the other hand, the Americans do not think personal relationship is a very personal matter.

2. money 2:
Russians lend money, but they usually expect it to be repaid. It is implied. You don't speak of it.

3. food 5:
That does seem to be a peculiar Russian way to show the guest that he is welcome,-- to stuff him with food. I agree. And of course, the hostess, for whom it is a chance to show that she is a good cook, and who, on the other hand, has undertaken more pains to prepare the treat than an American could probably realize,--would be offended, if she is just rejected flat. One just has to put up with it as with a "cultural phenomenon,"--and the person in question seems to have adopted the only right way.

4. possessions 4:
As for the first part, it is true: the cultural difference is really striking. I was very much surprised, when at the New Year celebrations every guest made his/her own contribution to the table (a box of chocolates, a bowl of salad, etc.),--and after the feast just wrapped up what remained of his/her contribution and calmly took it away with him/her! As for the second part, it seems to be quite logical from the hygienic point of view. I wouldn't share my bottled water with people straight out of the bottle either.

5. work 6:
In Russia people at the counter can smile without any attention from their fellow co-workers if they do not talk too much to customers. Work is the place to make money for the majority of people, not all. If a person doesn't often smile at work, it doesn't mean s/he hates it!

6. small talk 7:
In Russia people like talking politics as well as complaining about their troubles and misfortunes,--in a way that could puzzle Americans.

APPENDIX G:
A LIST OF AMERICAN "TRAITS" AS DESCRIBED BY RUSSIAN SUBJECTS

	"Positive Traits"	"Negative Traits"
1.	ability to relax and get fun	inability to concentrate
2.	informality; self-confidence	lack of self-criticism
3.	punctuality; friendliness; diligence; responsibility	too much pragmatism; pragmatic attitude to sex
4.	friendliness; readiness to help; politeness (sometimes too artificial)	too practical, rational; can suppress their feeling if they "can't afford it"
5.	independence; friendliness; self-respect	egotism; always think they are the best and unique
6.	independence (financial); kindness, willingness to help (when their interests don't clash with yours)	lack of depth and inability to go beyond one's frame of experience; adherence to rules and procedures
7.	friendliness; sociability, amiability; willingness to help	indirectness about what they expect you to do for them
8.	friendliness; ability to work hard; desire to be independent	not caring about anything but themselves; lack of sincerity; don't like to have a serious relationship
9.	self-confidence; self-reliance; independence; ability to adapt	over consuming, overexaggerated individualism
10.	friendliness	individualism and selfishness
11.	ability to work hard; politeness	indifference to anybody but themselves

APPENDIX H:
A LIST OF RUSSIAN "TRAITS" AS DESCRIBED BY AMERICAN SUBJECTS

	"Positive Traits"	"Negative Traits"
1.	culture, erudition	snobbery, supermicism
2.	ability to survive	no respect for personal space and privacy
3.	hospitality, honesty	self-depriciation
4.	friendly and open when they know you	mean, pushy when they don't know you
5.	faith and loyalty to friends	difficult to say "no" to them
6.	generosity	sexism
7.	honesty (friends are not afraid to say what they think), helpfulness	men carrying things for women (sexism)
8.	hospitality	insistence that their way is the right way
9.	warmth, hospitality, straightforwardness, down-to-earth	prejudiced
10.	hospitality (not among young, though)	"I'm better than you" attitude
11.	love of culture, music, art, land; adaptation; hospitality	do not like to take risks (with money, feelings, thoughts); not hospitable if they don't know you
12.	interested in you emotionally and physically	can take it far and invade your space
13.	loyalty to each other (friend)	lack of outlook (no plans or goals)